

The Chicago Eagle.

PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY

HENRY F. DONOVAN.

An Independent Political Newspaper,
Fearless and Truthful.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, \$2.00 PER YEAR

ADDRESS ALL COMMUNICATIONS TO
HENRY F. DONOVAN, Editor and Proprietor,
87, 89, 91, 93 South Jefferson Street, Chicago.Entered at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois,
as second-class matter.The Eagle's
CIRCULATION

AVERAGES

43,642 Papers

EVERY WEEK IN THE YEAR.

NOTICE

THE EAGLE can be ordered at Chas. Macdonald & Co.'s literary emporium and book store, 55 Washington street, and at all first-class news stands throughout the West.

FOR MAYOR,
JOHN P. HOPKINS.

HOPKINS OUGHT TO RUN.

It is a pity that Mayor Hopkins persists in his refusal to accept a renomination at the hands of his party.

He could lead the Democracy of Cook County to victory, as could perhaps no other man in Cook County today. Mr. Hopkins has made for himself a record as chief executive of this city which would be the strongest and safest platform upon which in the forthcoming election. He is a man full of resource and energy, a practical man of affairs, who demonstrated his ability as a political fighter when he measured swords with that champion of Republicanism, George B. Swift, and vanquished him.

He would be the logical candidate to oppose Swift again, and The Eagle believes he could defeat him again. Besides all this, it is rather humiliating for the great Democratic party of Chicago, until recently triumphant and apparently invincible, to be compelled to go hawking the mayoralty nomination about and begging of every Tom, Dick and Harry to accept it.

Most of those men to whom this honor has been practically tendered have shown no readiness to accept it, presumably because they have no confidence in their own ability to win.

With Mr. Hopkins it would be different, and it is a pity he will not accept, for his very declaration to run has had a disheartening effect upon his party.

The Eagle would like once again to see the Swift-Hopkins contest fought out. In a fair fight Hopkins could win.

THE "CONTEST" KNOCKED OUT.

County Judge Carter has put the quietus upon the decomposed Swift-Hopkins contest. The worthy occupant of the county bench threw the case out of court bodily, and there is in all probability an end of it.

It was time for this fraud and humbug to be killed off.

It had not only served its purpose, but those back of it had overreached themselves.

It was a cute little piece of gallery play up to a certain point. Had the promoters of the contest allowed it to rest after Judge Seales had knocked the fool proceedings galley west, there might have been an opportunity to say, Swift was elected, the contest was properly and legally brought, but a partisan judge defeated our intentions.

Instead of doing this, however, they forced the contest into Judge Carter's term, and he, though a strong Republican partisan, was also impelled by the logic of the facts to throw out the case.

As a matter of fact, therefore, it would seem the contest was not properly brought, and people are now inclined to the further deduction that Hopkins was elected by precisely the majority claimed for him and by virtue of which

he now sits as Mayor of the city of Chicago.

The contest was evidently never honestly intended. The very manner in which it was brought discloses that fact. It was evident from the first that the contestants never expected to prove the charges of fraud alleged by them, for they were unable and did not attempt to give one specific case in support of their general allegations.

The "contest" was useful no doubt in forcing certain candidates for the Republican nomination for Mayor this spring out of the field, but it being kept up too long the force has redounded to the injury of the particular candidates whom it was designed to benefit.

"VIVISECTION IN AMERICA."

Chicago Tribune: An article in the Critic relates some of the sickening facts of the vivisection of animals as collected by Dr. Leffingwell, who asserts that "upon no ethical question of our day is there a more striking difference of opinion than regarding the value or the rightness of experimentation upon living animals." But he has no doubts on the subject. He says the men who commit the atrocities of vivisection in the name of science are, as a rule, not physicians or surgeons. Few of them have ever practiced medicine or surgery. They have spent their lives within the narrow limits of the laboratory, engaged in their cruel work. The more the true physician or surgeon sees of suffering the more kindly he feels for unfortunate, be they human or brute. Hence he cannot approve of the acts of atrocious cruelty performed in the name of science. The character of some of these cruelties is indicated by the following extract:

"Animals have been subjected to burning, baking, freezing; saturation with induramable oil and then setting on fire; starvation to death; skinning alive; larding the feet with nails; crushing and tormenting in every imaginable way. . . . Von Lesser, of Germany, made a long series of experiments in scalding animals to death. He plunged a dog for thirty seconds into boiling water; he scalded another four times, at various intervals; even animals which have just passed through the pangs of parturition do not escape. . . . Chauveau 'sensitized' more than eighty large animals, mostly horses and mules, worn out in the service of man, to almost the extreme torture possible to conceive, not, as he expressly tells us, to solve any problem in medical theory, but simply to see what degree of pain can be inflicted through irritation of the spinal cord."

Apologists for vivisection may claim that such acts of cruelty are confined to the continent of Europe, but this is not so. In Jersey City one individual has performed a series of a hundred and forty-one experiments, his object being "to produce the greatest amount of injury" to the spinal cord and its attachments without killing the animal outright. With this end in view he hobbled the limbs of a great number of dogs and then dropped them from a height of twenty-five feet. This conduct is fitly characterized by the British Medical Journal as "the most wanton and stupid cruelty we have ever seen chrouched under the guise of scientific experiment." For some years past vivisection in England has been greatly restricted by law, and it ought to be so in this country. While the practice may be allowed in medical schools it should be restricted there and prohibited altogether in the colleges. It may be a necessary preparation for the medical profession, but is of no possible utility to the many thousands of college men who choose some other profession than that of medicine. The humane societies have accomplished much good in the restriction of these cruelties, but there is still room for them to interpose with great advantage to prevent needless suffering to thousands of poor brutes who are subjected to the most severe tortures, the least ignoble result of which is the gratification of an idle curiosity.

MR. BALL AGAIN.

William T. Ball, as was expected, has been renominated by the Republicans of the North Town for assessor, and if all signs do not fail that gentleman will succeed himself. It is not saying too much of Mr. Ball to assert that he has made a model office as assessor for the North Town during the past three or four years.

His administration of the affairs of that office has been clean, capable and exemplary. Personally, he is a gentleman of public and integrity. There is a certain something about him that makes him a favorite among his many acquaintances. Of course, some of the organs of public propriety who would run political primaries as well as everything else on the Sunday school plan, have raised a howl about the manner in which the nomination of the ticket of which Mr. Ball was the head was secured.

There is neither reason nor justification for this. Mr. Ball is a practical politician. Of course he is. If he wasn't he wouldn't be North Town assessor. He is not a stenographer, therefore he is not a court reporter; he is not the editor of a daily. But he knows his own business and he minds it. The people, and particularly the taxpayers, of North Chicago are to be congratulated.

TOO MUCH MONKEY WORK.

George B. Swift will be the next Republican nominee for Mayor, and he will be elected if the Democrats do not get a stir onto them.

There is a little too much monkey work and dicker with irresponsible parties on the side of the Democrats of Cook County.

This statement is not intended as a reflection upon Chairman Peabody of the Cook County Central Committee. Mr. Peabody has shown himself to be a man of principle, of backbone, and energy. He may wear red boots in summer, but recent events have proven that he carries a good, manly brain, and lots of solid judgment in his head all the year round.

The manner in which Mr. Peabody called down the impudent and outrageous intervention of the man easily

and that portion of the Civic Federation which he represents, in the affairs of the Democratic party, is deserving of the applause of all good citizens.

The man who attempt to dictate to another how much dry-goods he shall buy for Christmas, whether he shall take tea or coffee for his breakfast, is guilty of a most unpardonable impertinence.

Not less so the Civic Federation when it undertakes to listen to and settle disputes between Democrats on purely party questions and to act upon the representations of party soreheads by calling upon the head of the party organization to go all over these matters with the irresponsible representative of the Civic Federation. Peabody, like a wise man, refused to accept any such invitation, and quietly informed the Civic Federation that the Democratic party could take care of its own business.

SOME ADVICE TO SCHOOL INSPECTORS.

The Board of Education is now engaged in an effort to make a certain class of citizens perform their duty.

This class is composed in the main of people of two distinct ways of thinking on matters politic. One of these is the crowd which hugs itself in the belief that cash can protect it from all the calls of duty from the standpoint of citizenship of the United States.

These people are made up of that particular strain which in the days of the civil war found it convenient to protect itself by hiring through its representatives substitutes who received their bounty and faced the bullets and the steel their brothers feared to meet.

The other crowd is made up of cunning hypocrites, who, while inveigling against corruption in high places, against rascally among public officials, are themselves most active in producing the conditions which they pretend to deplore.

It is to be hoped that the Board of Education will have strength and character enough to resist the influences which will undoubtedly be brought to bear upon it with a view to keeping it from the performance of its plain duty.

This duty is the fair equalization of all school property, the fair and full taxation of the same, and the consequent selling of the public funds and to the relief of the taxpayer of Cook County many thousands of dollars.

It is the duty of all persons who receive an income of more than \$5,000 a year to make specific report thereon to the Collector of Internal Revenue. If the income exceeds \$4,000 the 2 per cent. tax is to be collected thereon. There are exemptions, however, all of which appear in the blanks that are required by the department. Some interesting data may be gathered from these returns. If a public officer has received extraordinary profits he must account for the same as part of his income. Unfortunately such returns cannot be made public. It is a remark of Blackstone, in substance, that the ingenuity of man in devising legislation has never been equal to the ingenuity of men who had direct personal interest in circumventing it. All the good people who wish the mass of the people to take their guides in all public affairs will exert their ingenuity for the purpose of representing their incomes to be less than it is in reality.

This class might take the course gleefully pursued by a well-known lawyer, now deceased, who, when income tax was formerly collected, returned his professional income as \$60,000, but as he did not appear to pay the tax thereon a deputy collector waited upon him for the amount, informing him that he was delinquent. "You are mistaken, my friend," said the attorney. "I was required to bring correct returns of my income. I have done so. You are obliged to collect it. Do so if you can." Intimation has been made that there would be some tall swearing with reference to incomes, but the appearances also are that there will be some very thorough investigation upon the part of the United States with reference to returns.

It affords genuine pleasure to learn that there are parts of the country unaffected by the present financial and industrial depression. The following, taken from a trustworthy contemporary in Georgia, may be considered as authentic: "Reports from various counties in the State show that farmers and residents generally have little to complain of this winter. While the season has been unusually severe and the State has not escaped the depression common to the whole country, yet nobody is suffering from hunger. There is plenty of hominy and corn, and Georgia hogs have not been fatter since we can remember." Hunger in Georgia! Appetites going unappeased with hominy, corn and hog in plenty! What is more succulent than hominy cake? Nothing in the world is better for it is corn dodgers and hog; or, what is more likely, hockeys, with a piece of Georgia bacon along side. Who, we ask of titled chiefs, would order cluck, or henriettes, or cutlets, when he could have hockeys, patties by Mammy's hand and fried on a griddle lubricated with the fat of a Georgia shote? We are assured on impeccable authority that the Hon. Hoke Smith discusses each morning before going to the department of the interior six steaming hockeys and a goodly portion of a hog of unbroken Georgia lineage. And every Georgia poet riddles reflectively at snowy hominy cakes as he weaves his rhymes. Glorious Georgia! Happy, contented, well-fed Georgians! Though the world be troubled with famine, pestilence and bond issues, there is plenty of corn and hominy on hand, and the hogs have not been fatter since we can remember. Hog and hominy for one! Make it two!

An Indianapolis man has disappointed four wedding parties within the last two weeks. At the last moment he deserts his would-be bride and backs out. This is a bona fide case of "heart failure."

A Cincinnati amateur poetess read over one of her own productions and died. More encouragement should be given to such poetical work as that.

Ex-Governor Hogg will start a daily paper in Dallas. We look for great things from this Hogg pen.

IN THE SPRINGFIELD CAMP.

(Continued from first page.)

Cody—Four Chicago park bills. Condo—A sleeping car regulator that will regulate. Porters shall not demand or receive any fee.

De Forest—Compelling gas companies to put mains down at own expense when so ordered by city council; shall also make connections with consumers' pipes at expense of gas company. If gas companies refuse it shall stand indebted to city in sum of \$5,000. Also a bill prohibiting the running of slops or offal from distillery, brewery, starch or glucose factory.

Ferns—No person shall be eligible to elective office unless he is a bona fide owner of real estate.

Fleming—Appropriates \$5,000 for typewriters for the Supreme Court.

Gower—Appropriates \$56,128 for the Pontiac Reformatory.

Guthrie—The usual appropriation for the State Board of Agriculture.

McCarthy—Prohibiting the demanding of a deposit to secure the payment of gas, electric and water bills.

McConnell—Reducing the interest on redemptions from 8 to 7 per cent.

McDonald of Williamson—Authorizing boards of supervisors to employ an expert to investigate the books and accounts of county officers. Also making judgment notes void.

Merritt—Providing a new code of signals for coal mines. Also changing the rules in regard to blasting in coal mines.

Muir—Authorizing the Chicago sanitary district to increase its tax levy to 1 1/2 per cent.

Murdoch—To permanently locate land lines.

Needles—To provide for the expenses of the State government to July 1, 1897.

Lotke—To regulate the business of mercantile agencies.

Revell—To prohibit the erection of buildings, or occupy the land in parks. Also to repeal the lien law. Also to amend the eminent domain act. Also in relation to building associations.

Schubert—For opening and extending streets through parks.

Shubert—Authorizing railroads to purchase stock of connecting or leased railroads.

House bills were then read a second time and that of Cochran occupied the time to adjournment. It regulates the assignment of notes secured by chattel mortgage. An amendment by Miller of Cook was adopted, providing that the note must state on its face that it is secured by a chattel mortgage. Several committee amendments were adopted, and the bill ordered to third reading.

In the House this morning, Mr. Murdoch introduced a joint resolution which was adopted requesting the Illinois delegation in Congress to support the railroad arbitration bill. It was introduced in the Senate by Mr. Monroe.

Statutory assaults on the high hat will not be taken seriously by those who wear it, and it will continue to be worn so long as fashion so decrees. "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who wishes to wear so long as fashion so decrees, "Let me make the fashion in hats and I do not care who makes the laws," is as applicable in this matter as in some other matters. Theater managers have the right under general police regulations to protect patrons in a clear view of the stage in their playhouses. No woman, when requested to remove an obstructive hat, would hesitate to do so or leave the theater. Many under prevailing culture would prefer to leave the theater, because the half has to be dressed one way to support the high hat and another way is more fitting for the high hat is off. Managers hesitate to ask removal of the hat, because they fear the fiscal effect of seeing a number of women quit their houses rather than show unarranged or deranged hair. The solution of the question lies with women themselves. If they value a confection of millinery more than the equity of sight of a theater stage for others, they will invalidate any statute aimed to accomplish the object in view. No sensitive or thoughtful woman who